AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached four (4) sheets of formal drawings (Figs. 1-4) replace Figs. 1-4 as originally filed. The attached four (4) sheets of formal drawings (Figs. 1-4) include the same content as Figs. 1-4 as originally filed.

Attached: Replacement Sheets (4)

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-reference application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 8-12, 14-16, 18-22, 24-26, 28-32, 34-36, and 38-40 are amended, and claims 1-40 are pending in the application.

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as amended clarify the claimed feature that the signaling network node *classifies* the received signaling message *as assigned to a specific message class* based on prescribed message class criteria, and *selects* one of the message class entries based on determining the corresponding identified message class of the one message class entry *matches the one message class of the received signaling message*. Hence, the signaling network node specifically classifies the received signaling message as being *assigned* to a specific message class based on implementing prescribed classification criteria. As described for example on page 7, line 4 to page 8, line 25 (with respect to Fig. 2) and page 9, line 28 to page 10, line 8 with respect to Fig. 4, the processor executes the classification according to the prescribed message class criteria to *assign* the received signaling message to a specific message class.

Each of the independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as amended further specify that the signaling network node selects the one message class entry that *matches* the specific message class of the received signaling message. (See, e.g., page 10, lines 7-9 of the specification).

Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC §103 in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0016684 by Prasad et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed, as Prasad et al. does not disclose or suggest the features of claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 as amended.

Prasad et al. describes that a processor in a signal transfer point (STP) "**first** reviews the SS7 routing table (RT) 210 to determine the routing context associated with the routing code specified by the received SS7 signal as the destination address." Further the Office Action admits that Prasad et al. teaches that Prasad et al. "**associates** the routing codes to routing contexts **stored in a routing table**" and "transmits the SS7 signal to a destination after **determining the specific routing contexts** and their associated routing codes". Hence, Prasad et al. requires accessing the routing table in order to **determine** the associated routing context.

In contrast, each of the independent claims specify *classifying* the received signaling

Amendment filed Monday, October 2, 2006
Appln. No. 10/022,443
Page 12

message as *assigned to a __specific__ message class* based on prescribed message selection class criteria. Prasad et al. provides no disclosure or suggestion of *classifying* the received signaling message based on prescribed message selection class criteria and then selecting a message class entry based on the corresponding identified message class *matching the specific message class*, because Prasad et al. requires actually <u>accessing</u> the table in order to **determine** the routing context.

     For these and other reasons, the § 103 rejection should be withdrawn.

     It is believed the dependent claims are allowable in view of the foregoing.

     In view of the above, it is believed this application is in condition for allowance, and such a Notice is respectfully solicited.

     To the extent necessary, Applicant petitions for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including any missing or insufficient fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.17(a), to Deposit Account No. 50-1130, under Order No. 95-474, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

<div align="right">

Respectfully submitted,

Leon R. Turkevich
Registration No. 34,035

</div>

Customer No. 23164
(202) 261-1059
Date: Monday, October 2, 2006
(September 30, 2006 = Saturday)

Amendment filed Monday, October 2, 2006
Appln. No. 10/022,443
Page 13